

acuta were its type species, and that such references number in their hundreds. I doubt if a single case could be found where *Pleurocera* is used as though *P. verrucosa* were the type species, other than in those very few references already cited in the correspondence regarding this question.

I am in the midst of preparing a manual for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on the freshwater snails of North America. Such a manual is not available to freshwater biologists at present, and so this one, whatever its virtues or faults, will become the main standard for identification. It will be well publicised, readily available, and in fact, will be widely distributed free of charge. Preceding the publication of this manual I prepared an outline of the classification of these gastropods (*J. Conchyliol.* 1978, vol. 105: 3–9; *Malacol. Rev.* 1979, vol. 13: 97–100) already referred to in the papers on this case. In all these publications, *Pleurocera* is used as though *P. acuta* were its type species.

COMMENT ON PROPOSALS CONCERNING THE NAMES OF FOUR
SPECIES OF CARABIDAE (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA) ESTABLISHED
BY LINNAEUS

Z.N.(S) 1237

(see vol. 34: 243–246)

By M. Mroczkowski (*Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences, ul.
Wilcza 64, Warsaw, Poland*)

I am opposed to the late Professor Lindroth's proposals, for the following reasons:

Proposal 1. Both species, *Pterostichus caerulescens* auctorum and *P. cupreus* auctorum, are very well known and common eurosiberian species. Both are unmistakably identified by all coleopterists. Both names are naturalised by long usage in coleopterology. To replace *P. caerulescens* auctorum by *P. versicolor* (Sturm, 1824) and to synonymise *P. caerulescens* with *P. cupreus* would disrupt stability of nomenclature and cause great confusion. I therefore propose another solution and ask the Commission:

- (1) to use its plenary powers
 - (a) to suppress all designations of type specimens hitherto made for the nominal species *Carabus caerulescens* Linnaeus, 1758 and *C. cupreus* Linnaeus, 1758, and, having done so,
 - (b) to designate the first specimen mentioned on : 243 of the late Professor Lindroth's proposal as neotype of *C. cupreus* Linnaeus, 1758, and
 - (c) to designate the type specimen of *Platysma versicolor* Sturm, 1824, as neotype of *Carabus caerulescens* Linnaeus, 1758;

- (2) to place the specific names *caerulescens* Linnaeus, 1758 and *cupreus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in combination with the generic name *Carabus*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

Proposal 3. The species *Pterostichus vulgaris* (Linnaeus, 1758) (with *Carabus melanarius* Illiger, 1798 as a synonym) is a very common and well-known eurosiberian species, unmistakably identified by all coleopterists. The name *Pterostichus vulgaris* is well known and is in widespread use. There is no risk of confusing it with *Amara lunicollis* Schiødte, 1837 (= *Carabus vulgaris* Panzer, 1797, non Linnaeus, 1758) which belongs to another tribe of carabid beetles. The designation of lectotype for *Carabus vulgaris* Linnaeus, 1758 made by the late Professor Lindroth is a sufficient solution and there is no need for any action by the Commission.

Proposal 4. The species *Bembidion rupestre* auctorum (with *Bembidion bruxellense* Wesmaël, 1835 as a synonym) is a common and well-known european species. The name *B. rupestre* is in current use by all coleopterists and to replace it by *B. bruxellense* would disrupt stability and cause confusion. I therefore propose another solution and ask the Commission:

- (1) to use its plenary powers
- (a) to suppress all designations of type specimen hitherto made for the nominal species *Cicindela rupestris* Linnaeus, 1767, and, having done so,
 - (b) to designate the type specimen of *Bembidion bruxellense* Wesmaël, 1835, as neotype of *Cicindela rupestris* Linnaeus, 1767;
- (2) to place the specific name *rupestris* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen *Cicindela rupestris*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

COMMENTS ON APPLICATION FOR SUPPRESSION AND VALIDATION OF ELAPID SNAKE NAMES. Z.N.(S) 2128

(see vol. 33: 73-84; vol. 34: 8)

- (1) By G.L. Underwood (*City of London Polytechnic*) and A.F. Stimson (*British Museum (Natural History), London, SW7 5BD*)

We are writing to let you know that the request by Smith & Smith for the suppression and validation of names related to the ELAPIDAE has our wholehearted support.

One small point occurs. In 1893 Cope (*Amer. Nat.*: 480) proposed the family-group name URIECHINAE based on *Uriechis* Peters, 1854 (*Monatsber. Akad. Wiss. Berlin*: 623), at that time considered a valid name, but now a subjective synonym of *Aparallactus*. The synonymising of these two genera occurred before 1961, and although the family-group name APARAL-